UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,774	06/14/2001	Michael E. Houston	003592-007	9292

21839 7590 09/22/2003

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER
KIM, YOUNG J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1637	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/882,774	HOUSTON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Young J. Kim	1637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) 1-57 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-11, 14-27, and 57, drawn to a peptide comprised of formula I, a method of its making, and a composition comprising the peptide, and its method of eliciting an immune response, classified in class 530, subclass 300.

II. Claims 12 and 13, drawn to a peptide of SEQ ID Number 5, classified in class 530, subclass 300.

III. Claims 28-31 and 34, drawn to an antibody specific for peptide of I, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.

IV. Claims 32 and 33, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition, classified in class 424, subclass 1.49.

V. Claims 35-41, drawn to a vaccine, classified in class 424, subclass 9.2.

VI. Claims 42-45, drawn to a method of preventing microbial infection by administering a peptide, classified in class 514, subclass 2.

VII. Claims 46-48, drawn to a method of treating a microbial infection by administering an antibody, classified in class 424, subclass 130.1.

VIII. Claims 49-54, drawn to a method of detecting the presence of a microorganism, classified in class 436, subclass 500.

IX. Claims 55 and 56, drawn to method of the presence of titer against a microbial protein, classified in class 436, subclass 500.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-V are unrelated to each other. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different physical structures, employed for different purposes. For example, the peptide of I requires that the first amino acid be Ile, Leu, or Val, while the peptide of II is a Glutamic acid, rendering the two peptides different in their structures. Similarly, the antibody, pharmaceutical composition, and vaccine are also structurally different from the peptide, rendering their different uses.

Inventions I and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the peptide of I can be used in a materially different process, i.e., to elicit an immune response, the method of which has been included in Group I.

Inventions I and II are unrelated to Inventions VII-IX. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the peptide of I and II are not required for the methods of VII-IX. For example, the method of treating a microbial infection by administering an antibody (Invention VII) does not require the peptide of I or II, but only the antibody. Inventions VIII and IX, in similar manners, do not require the peptide of I or II in order to practice their methods.

Inventions II and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the method of VI does not require the products of II.

Inventions III and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the antibody of III is not required in the method of VI.

Inventions III and VII-IX are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) ***the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product*** (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the antibody of III can be used in any of the distinct methods of VII-IX.

Inventions IV-V are unrelated to Inventions VI-IX. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the pharmaceutical composition and vaccine of IV and V are not required in any of the methods of VI-IX.

Inventions VI-IX are unrelated to each other. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the

different inventions employ different modes of operations to achieve different effects. For example, the method of preventing microbial infection of VI requires the administration of a peptide, an ingredient which is not required by the methods of VII-IX. Additionally, while methods of VII-IX employ the use of antibody, the methods requires different modes of operations in order to achieve the different outcomes of treating microbial infection (Invention VII), detecting the presence of a microorganism (Invention VIII), and determining the presence of titer against a microbial protein (Invention IX).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was not made to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement due to the complex nature of the requirement (MPEP § 812.01).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Young J. Kim whose telephone number is (703) 308-9348. The Examiner can normally be reached from 8:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Primary Examiner in charge of the prosecution, Dr. Kenneth Horlick, can be reached at (703)-308-3905. If the attempts to reach the above Examiners are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion, can be reached at (703) 308-1119. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1637 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 CFR 1.6(d)). NOTE: If applicant does submit a paper by FAX, the original copy should be retained by applicant

or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED, so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office. All official documents must be sent to the Official Tech Center Fax number: (703) 872-9306. For Unofficial documents, faxes can be sent directly to the Examiner at (703) 746-3172. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Young J. Kim

9/11/03

KENNETH R. HORLICK, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER

9/16/03